DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 698 EA 006 165

AUTHOR Smith, Marzell
TITLE The Secondary School Administrator and Student Disruption in the Desegregation-Integration Process.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 15-19, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Age Grade Placement; *Behavior Problems; *Educational Research; *Integration Effects; Principals; *Racial Factors; Senior High Schools; Student Alienation; Urban Schools; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS Student Disruption

ABSTRACT

Information is presented in this report on whether or not students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and black or white students within those schools differ and whether or not these differences contribute to general disruption and conflict. Significant relationships were found between students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and between black and white students. Disruption was related to the race of students, their grade placement, and age-grade differential; but not to the type of academic program in which they enrolled. Conclusions are based on data collected from 15 senior high schools in New York State. (Editors)

ED 090698

JUN 14 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT DISRUPTION IN THE DESEGREGATION-INTEGRATION PROCESS

By
Marzell Smith
University of Miami

Presented at the annual
meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Chicago
April 15-19, 1974

EA 006 165

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT DISRUPTION IN THE DESEGREGATION-INTEGRATION PROCESS

Abstract

The findings of this study indicated that students in disrupted schools can be considered a different population from students in nondisrupted schools with respect to their perceptions and feelings about school power structure. Students in disrupted schools apparently did not want more student control per se but felt that there was not enough school autonomy. Students in nondisrupted schools felt students had more control and were relatively less concerned about the balance between school autonomy and external control.

Black-white comparisons should be made cautiously, but whites were apparently more comfortable with external control than blacks. Blacks appeared to be more concerned with the autonomy of their school communities than whites.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT DISRUPTION IN THE DESEGREGATION-INTEGRATION PROCESS

Background

A contemporary phenomenon affecting educational institutions in this country and abroad is an excessive amount of school disruption by students. Bailey (1970) in a study of more than a thousand secondary schools for the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) found that fifty-nine per cent of the high schools and fifty-six per cent of the junior high schools had experienced some form of protest. The Center for Research and Education in American Liberties at Columbia University (1969) reported that 348 high schools in thirty-eight states had undergone some form of disruption between November, 1968, and February, 1969, and that an additional 239 had suffered serious episodes.

The House Subcommittee on General Education (1968-1969) in a survey of the nation's 29,000 secondary schools (public, private, and parochial) found that eighteen per cent had experienced serious protests; the major issues were disciplinary rules, dress codes, school services, facilities, curriculum. It was further determined that the racial issue was a factor in more than fifty per cent of the protests in schools with student enrollment greater than 1,000 and in thirty per cent of the smaller schools. Racial issues were involved in city school protests about four times as often as in suburban or rural schools.

In another study, A Profile of Large City Schools (1970), conducted for the NASSP, in 700 high schools in forty-five cities with a population

greater than 300,000, it was concluded that conflict among and between students and faculty was the most prevalent aspect of the large city high schools today.

The National School Public Relations Association (1971) published the results of a newspaper survey which examined the 130 most serious cases of disruption and concluded that:

> Sixty-three per cent of the disrupted schools were located in urban areas, 33 per cent in suburban areas, and 4 per cent in rural areas and that 26 per cent of the disruption occurred in cities of 100,000 population or less; 11 per cent in cities of 100,000 to 500,000; 8 per cent in cities of between 500,000 and one million; 55 per cent in cities of a million or more in population /p. 9/

The Senate Subcommittee (Dodd) on Juvenile Delinquency (1970) surveyed 110 big city school districts and concluded that violence in the public schools has increased dramatically in the last few years; however, the committee warned that its statistics were too sketchy to express more than a trend.

Several sociological-psychological studies (Bailey, 1970; Chesler, 1970, 1969, 1971; Coser, 1965; Flacks, 1970; Friedenberg, 1969; Bryant and Crowfoot, 1972; Stinchcombe, 1964; Wittes, 1971; Pileggi, 1969; Redl and Wineman, 1951; Libarle and Seligson, 1970; Weil, 1971; Iwamoto, 1965; Becker, 1953) provide information and a perspective from which to view this phenomenon.

Purpose

The purposes of the study were to investigate the following questions:

1. Do students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and black or white students within those schools differ with respect to mean scores on the following power structure variables and their differentials?

a. Perceived internal control

b. Perceived external control

c. Perceived student control

d. Ideal internal control

e. Ideal external control

f. Ideal student control

2. Do students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and black or white students within those schools differ with respect to mean scores on the following climate variables?

a. Perceived environmental support

b. Perceived teacher empathy

c. Perceived racism of school climate

d. Counseling satisfaction

3. Is the disruption status of a school independent of the following student variables (race, grade, type of academic program /college prep or other/, and age-grade placement /below, at, or above grade level/)?

Sample

This particular study was limited to the total 9-12 student population of 15 high schools in New York State. There were 1855 students in the sample. There were 15 ninth graders, 527 tenth graders, 695 eleventh graders and 615 twelfth graders. There were 1209 in college prep programs, and 646 in "other" programs; 140 below grade level, 863 at grade level, and 852 above grade level.

Instrument and Data Analysis

The questionnaire utilized in this study was developed originally in 1967 by Guskin and Wittes with the assistance of Chesler and Ben Dor to be utilized in the research of high school disruption across the country by the Educational Change Team, University of Michigan under contract funding by the U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research. The instrument was revised and refined for further use with high schools under grants from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Ford Foundation.

Intercorrelation matrices were computed for both the power structure variables (11 x 11) and climate variables (4 x 4) (Tables 1 and 2, Appendix A). Those matrices were subjected to alpha factor analysis (Kaiser, 1965) and produced factors of maximum generalizability in the sense of Cronbach's Alpha (1951). The procedure is iterative and works on the matrix $H^{-1} (R - U^2) H^{-1}$ where R is the original correlation matrix, U^2 is the matrix of uniqueness estimates, and H^{-1} is a matrix of the reciprocal factors of the communality estimates. The number of factors retained for rotation was equal to the eigenvalues of the matrix greater than one. The raw pattern was rotated according to the Direct Oblimin Criterion (Carroll, 1953) ($\Delta = 0$). Pattern coefficients equal to or greater than .3 were used for interpretation purposes. The alpha generalizability coefficients were compiled for each factor $\alpha = \left(\frac{\lambda - 1}{\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{P}{P-1}\right)$ where λ is the associated eigenvalue and P is the number of factors.

The data were analyzed using a factorial multivariate analysis of variance and chi-square contingency tests ($P < .05$).

Results

Significant differences were found by utilizing multivariate analysis of variance between students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and between black and white students with respect to mean scores on a group of eleven power structure variables. The factors of disruption and race were independent of one another with respect to these variables, as evidenced by no significant interaction (Tables 3A and 3B, Appendix A).

Univariate analyses indicated significant differences between mean scores of students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools on seven of the variables. Students in disrupted schools had significantly:

1. Higher mean scores on perceived external control
2. Lower mean scores on perceived student control
3. Higher mean scores on ideal internal control
4. Lower mean scores on ideal student control
5. Higher mean scores on external control differential (difference between perceived and ideal external control)
6. Lower mean scores on internal-external differential
7. Higher mean scores on other-student differential (student control--all internal and external control).

No significant differences were found on four of the variables: perceived internal control, ideal external control, internal control differential, and student control differential.

Univariate analyses indicated significant differences between scores of white students and black students on two of the variables. White students had significantly higher mean scores on ideal external control. The external control differential was negative for whites indicating perceived external control was less than ideal external control, while this differential was positive for blacks indicating the reverse.

Climate Variables

Significant differences were found by utilizing the multivariate analysis of variance between students attending disrupted or nondisrupted schools and between black and white students with respect to mean scores on a group of four climate variables. The factors of disruption and race were not independent of one another with respect to these variables, as evidenced by significant interactions (Tables 4A, 4B, and 4C, Appendix A).

Univariate analyses indicated that students attending nondisrupted schools had significantly higher mean scores on perceived teacher empathy than students in disrupted schools. No significant differences were found on the other three variables: perceived environmental support, perceived racism of school social climate, and counseling satisfaction.

Univariate analyses revealed that white students had significantly higher mean scores than black students on perceived teacher empathy and on perceived racism of school social climate.

Student Variables

Based on a chi-square analysis (Tables 5A, 5B, 5C, and 5D, Appendix A) disruption was found to be related to the race of students, their grade

placement and, age-grade differential but not related to the type of academic program in which they enrolled.

Whites were found in nondisrupted schools more frequently than expected, blacks less frequently; in disrupted schools whites were found less frequently than expected, blacks more frequently. Disrupted schools had more 12th graders than expected and fewer 9th and 10th graders; nondisrupted schools had fewer 12th graders than expected and more 9th and 10th graders. Disrupted schools had more students above normal grade placement than expected and fewer students below or at normal grade levels. Nondisrupted schools had fewer students above normal grade placement than expected and more students below or at normal grade levels.

Discussion and Conclusions

Power Structure Variables

The findings indicated that students in disrupted schools can be considered representative of a different population from students in nondisrupted schools with respect to their perceptions and feelings about school power structure. Students in disrupted schools apparently did not want more student control per se but felt that there was not enough school autonomy. Students in nondisrupted schools felt students had more control and were relatively less concerned about the balance between school autonomy and external control.

Black-white comparisons should be made cautiously, but whites were apparently more comfortable with external control than blacks. Blacks appeared to be more concerned with the autonomy of their school communities than whites.

Climate Variables

Subject to the stated caution about white population representativeness, interaction effects emerged strongly on the variables of perceived teacher empathy and counseling satisfaction and to a lesser degree for perceived racism of school climate. The strong differences were within the white respondents while black responses appeared relatively independent of environment. A small but significant overall difference in teacher empathy emerged in the disruption comparison. The black-white difference in perceived racism appeared to be characteristic of a liberal or activist white minority, rather than a typical population of middle American white students.

Student Variables

Chi-square analyses tended to point toward the importance of achievement factors in (or as a result of) school disruption. Grade placement and age-grade differentials as indicators of achievement levels pointed to the academic problems associated with school disruption and would suggest further research along these lines.

Based upon the findings the following conclusions were reached with regard to school disruption in the schools studied:

1. Power structure variables and climate variables can discriminate between disrupted and nondisrupted school populations.

2. Students of disrupted schools feel they have insufficient autonomy in their schools and are willing to subordinate student control of the school community to internal control by teachers and administrators.

3. Black students, especially, are in favor of internal as opposed to external control.

4. Students in nondisrupted schools place a high value on student control.

5. Empathy of students for teacher roles is high in nondisrupted schools.

6. In nondisrupted schools white students tend to have more empathy for teacher roles and to be more satisfied with counseling than blacks.

7. Achievement factors appear to bear an important relationship to school disruption.

REFERENCES

Bailey, S. K. Disruption in urban public secondary schools. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Becker, H. The teacher in the authority system of the public schools. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1953, 27, 128-141.

Bryant, B. Intergroup conflict and the instructional process in seven secondary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.

Carroll, J. B. An analytical solution for approximating simple structure in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1953, 18.

Chesler, M. Student and administration crises. Educational Leadership, 1969, 27 (October), 34-42.

Chesler, M. Teacher training designs for improving instruction in interracial classrooms. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971, 7, 612-641.

Chesler, M. Negro-white interaction and teaching alternatives in desegregated classrooms. Reprinted from the book, Racial Crisis in American Education, R. Green (Ed.), Chicago: Follette, 1970.

Coser, L. Functions of social conflict. Glencoe, Illinios: Free Press, 1956.

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16.

Flacks, R. Social and cultural meanings of student revolt: Some informal comparative observations. Social Problems, 1970, 17, 340-357.

Friedenberg, E. Z. Current patterns of a generational conflict. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 2(25), 21.

House Subcommittee on General Education for the Year 1968-1969 did a comprehensive survey of all the nation 29,000 public, private, and parochial high schools. The results are summarized in Disruption in urban public secondary schools, S. K. Bailey, 1970, 8.

Iwamoto, D. Student behavior in secondary schools. Research Report. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, Research Division, 1965, 12.

Kaiser, F., & Caffery, J. Alpha factor analysis. Psychometrika, 30 (March, 1965), 1-14.

Libarle, M., & Seligson, T. The high school revolutionaries. New York: Random House, 1970.

National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C., August, 1971, 9.

Pileggi, N. Revolutionaries who have to be home by 7:30. Kappan, 1969, 1, 561.

Profile of large city schools. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Redl, F., & Wineman, D. Children who hate. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

Senate Subcommittee (Dodd) on Juvenile Delinquency summarized findings relative to high school disruption in, The National School Public Relations Association, January, 1970.

Stinchcombe, A. Rebellion in a high school. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1964.

Weil, R. A. College youth attitudes today. School and Society, 1971 (April), 246-247.

Wittes, S. Contemporary school crisis: A diagnosis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Educational Change Team, School of Education, University of Michigan, 1971.

APPENDIX A

TABLE I

DERIVED FACTORS (OBLIMIN) FOR THE
POWER STRUCTURE VARIABLE

Variables	Factors					Est Com*
	I	II	III	IV	V	
P IN CONTR	-.32	.16	-.81	-.02	-.09	.68
P EX CONTR	-.67	-.04	-.02	-.03	-.04	.60
P ST CONTR	-.01	.77	.98	-.12	.02	.82
IDEAL IN C	.02	.04	-.11	-.86	-.03	.49
IDEAL EX C	-.41	.04	-.09	-.51	-.02	.49
ID STD C	-.00	.11	-.03	-.04	-.51	.15
IN CON DIF	-.35	.13	-.66	.80	-.03	.68
EX CON DIF	-.01	-.13	.04	.06	.08	.66
ST CON DIF	-.98	.62	-.12	-.12	.99	.78
IN-EX DIF	.47	-.17	-.97	-.12	.01	.61
OTH-STD DIF	.25	.99	-.99	.71	-.01	.92
a	.74	.73	.62	.55	.14	

*Estimated Communality

TABLE 2

FACTOR MATRIX FOR CLIMATE VARIABLES
(NO ROTATION, ONE FACTOR EXTRACTED)

Variable	Factor I	Estimated Communality
Perceived Environmental Support	.73	.54
Perceived Teacher Empathy	.61	.38
Perceived Racism of School Climate	-.11	.01
Counseling Satisfaction	.40	.16
	.98	

TABLE 3A

(HYPOTHESIS 1)
SUMMARY OF TWO-WAY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF POWER STRUCTURE VARIABLES BY DISRUPTION AND RACE

Multivariate-Tests

TEST OF	APPROX F	df HYP	df ERR	PROB
Disr x Race	1.323	11.	1842	0.204
Disr	13.311	11.	1842	0.001*
Race	3.599	11.	1842	0.001*

Univariate Tests

Test of	Disr x Race		Disr		Race	
df	1,1852		1,1852		1,8152	
VARIABLE	F	PROB	F	PROB	F	PROB
P IN CONTR	1.132	0.286	1.422	0.233	0.847	0.356
P EX CONTR	0.588	0.443	113.101	0.001*	0.261	0.609
P ST CONTR	0.454	0.501	7.517	0.006*	0.029	0.863
IDEAL IN C	2.672	0.102	6.663	0.010*	1.743	0.187
IDEAL EX C	8.352	0.004*	1.845	0.174*	19.273	0.001*
ID STD CON	0.956	0.329	7.512	0.006*	3.109	0.078
IN CON DF	0.114	0.735	0.876	0.350	3.032	0.081
EX CON DIF	8.662	0.003*	49.705	0.001*	15.757	0.001*
ST CON DIF	0.003	0.957	0.309	0.577	1.549	0.213
IN-EX DIFF	2.861	0.091	64.219	0.001*	1.774	0.183
OTH-STD DIF	0.505	0.478	37.977	0.001*	0.098	0.754

*Significant <.05

TABLE 3B

(HYPOTHESIS 1)
FACTOR AND INTERACTION MEANS OF
POWER STRUCTURE VARIABLES

LEVEL OF		VARIABLE										
Disr.	Race	P IN CONTR	P EX CONTR	P ST CONTR	IDEAL IN C	IDEAL EX C	ID STD C	IN CON DIF	EX CON DIF	ST CON DIF	IN-EX DIF	OTH-STD DIF
						DISR x RACE INTERACTION[a]						
1	1	7.426	6.052	4.478	5.965	7.052	8.000	0.461	-1.000	-3.522	1.374	-4.522
1	2	7.169	6.196	4.593	7.004	6.105	7.837	0.165	0.091	-3.244	0.973	-4.177
2	1	7.196	7.152	4.435	6.696	6.304	8.065	0.500	0.848	-3.630	0.043	-5.478
2	2	7.313	7.055	4.268	7.253	6.319	7.594	0.060	0.736	-3.325	0.258	-5.831
						DISRUPTION[a]						
1	-	7.194	6.181	4.582	7.000	6.199	7.853	0.194	-0.017	-3.271	1.013	-4.212
2	-	7.305	7.062	4.279	7.216	6.318	7.625	0.089	0.744	-3.345	0.244	-5.808
						RACE[a]						
-	1	7.360	6.366	4.466	6.888	6.839	8.019	0.472	-0.472	-3.553	0.994	-4.795
-	2	7.224	6.526	4.468	7.100	6.187	7.743	0.124	0.339	-3.275	0.698	-4.814

[a] 1 = nondisrupted, 2 = disrupted; 1 = white, 2 = black

TABLE 4A

(HYPOTHESIS II)
SUMMARY OF TWO-WAY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE OF CLIMATE VARIABLES BY
DISRUPTION AND RACE

Multivariate Tests

Test of	Approx. F.	df Hyp	df$_1$ Err	Prob
Disruption x Race	5.614	4	1849	0.001*
Disruption	2.583	4	1849	0.035*
Race	43.097	4	1849	0.001*

Univariate Tests

	Dis. x Race		Disruption		Race	
DF	1,1852		1,1852		1,1852	
Variable	F	Prob	F	Prob	F	Prob
PC ENV SUP	1.121	0.290	0.311	0.577	0.454	0.501
PC TCH EMP	7.856	0.005*	6.030	0.014*	12.503	0.001*
PC RACISM	1.005	0.315	1.159	0.281	148.885	0.001*
COUNS SAT	8.066	0.005*	0.002	0.961	3.269	0.071

*Significant <.05

TABLE 4B

(HYPOTHESIS II)
FACTOR AND INTERACTION MEANS OF
CLIMATE VARIABLES

LEVEL OF		VARIABLE			
		Criteria			
Disr	Race	PC ENV SUP	PC TCH EMP	PC RACISM	COUNS SAT
		DISR x RACE INTERACTION[a]			
1	1	16.696	15.278	8.322	2.991
1	2	17.237	13.788	5.314	2.579
2	1	17.674	13.326	8.087	2.348
2	2	17.287	13.554	5.595	2.643
		DISRUPTION[a]			
1	-	17.183	13.936	5.613	2.620
2	-	17.312	13.539	5.759	2.623
		RACE[a]			
-	1	16.975	14.720	8.255	2.807
-	2	17.256	13.698	5.422	2.604

[a]1 = nondisrupted, 2 = disrupted; 1 = white, 2 = black

TABLE 4C

(HYPOTHESIS III)
SUMMARY OF MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
SIMPLE EFFECTS OF DISRUPTION WITHIN RACES
AND CLIMATE VARIABLES

Multivariate Tests

Test of	Approx F	DF Hyp	DF ERR	Prob
Disruption within whites	18.058	4	1849	0.001*
Disruption within blacks	2.845	4	1849	0.023*

Univariate Tests

	Disr within white		Disr within black	
DF	1,1852		1,1852	
Variable	F	Prob	F	Prob
PC ENV SUP	1.817	0.177	0.025	0.875
PC TCH EMP	20.552	0.001*	1.280	0.257
PC RACISM	29.554	0.001*	7.969	0.005*
COUNS SAT	10.195	0.001*	1.105	0.293*

*Significant <.05

TABLE 5A

CROSS TABULATION OF DISRUPTION BY
RACE OF STUDENT[a]

Disruption	Race				Total
	White		Black		
Nondisrupted	115	100.42	1042	1056.58	1157
Disrupted	46	60.58	652	637.42	698
Total	161		1694		1855

[a] $x^2 = 6.1614$, df = 1, P <.05

Obtained frequencies are above diagonals
Expected frequencies are below diagonals

TABLE 5B

CROSS TABULATION OF DISRUPTION BY GRADE OF STUDENT[a]

	Grade 9		10		11		12		Total
Nondisrupted	13	9.37	358	327.23	436	434.19	350	384.31	1157
Disrupted	2	5.63	169	197.77	259	260.81	265	230.79	695
Total	15		527		695		615		1852

[a] $x^2 = 18.580$, df = 3, P <.005

Obtained frequencies are above diagonals
Expected frequencies are below diagonals

TABLE 5C

CROSS TABULATION OF DISRUPTION BY AGE-GRADE DIFFERENTIAL[a]

	Below Grade		At Grade		Above Grade		Total
Nondisrupted	100	87.32	549	538.27	508	531.41	1157
Disrupted	40	52.68	314	324.73	344	320.59	698
Total	140		863		852		1855

[a] $x^2 = 8.2015$, df = 2, $P < .05$

Obtained frequencies are above diagonals
Expected frequencies are below diagonals

TABLE 5D

CROSS TABULATION OF DISRUPTION BY
TYPE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM[a]

	Academic Program				
	College Prep		Other		Total
Nondisrupted	753	754.08	404	402.92	1157
Disrupted	456	454.92	242	243.08	698
Total	1209		646		1855

[a] $x^2 = 0.012$, df = 1, P < .90 - not significant

Obtained frequencies are above diagonals
Expected frequencies are below diagonals